



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/808,693	03/25/2004	Martin R. Prince	MPK-00108	6061
25181	7590	01/17/2008	EXAMINER	
FOLEY HOAG, LLP			LAMPRECHT, JOEL	
PATENT GROUP, WORLD TRADE CENTER WEST				
155 SEAPORT BLVD			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BOSTON, MA 02110			3737	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/17/2008	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

44

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/808,693	PRINCE, MARTIN R.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Joel M. Lamprecht	3737

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 March 2004.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 60-79 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 60-79 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 25 March 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/15/05, 6/28/04</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
|   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Priority***

Applicant (or the assignees of this application if the assignee has undertaken the prosecution of the application) is required under 37 CFR 1.105 to provide the following information that the examiner has determined is reasonably necessary to the examination of this application.

There are numerous other co-pending application and issued patents, which disclose and claim similar or identical subject matter. In accordance with 37 CFR 1.105 and MPEP 704.11(a) subsection G, application (or the assignee) is respectfully requested to disclose all co-pending application and related patents and therein identify the specific claims of those application and/or patents which may provide basis for the priority of the instant application. This requirement is reasonably necessary to examination because, based on an initial review of the applications, *there exists overlapping subject matter throughout the history*, thus requiring an analysis of commonality of claimed subject matter to determine both patentability under 35 USC 101 double patenting. In the instant case, applicant owns or is mentioned as an inventor of a multitude of similar patented cases. Because the applicant (or assignee) is presumably far more cognizant of the contents of the claims and specifications in these applications than any of the Office staff, and has access to the source documents by which such comparison could be done better than within the Office, it is reasonable to require the applicant to provide the information needed to determine commonality amongst the claims.

Should applicant (or the assignee) believe that Double Patenting exists, then applicant (or the assignee) is invited to file Terminal Disclaimers and/or amend the currently pending claims in the interest of expediting the prosecution of the current application. Applicant (or the assignee) should note that a terminal disclaimer is effective to overcome an obviousness type double patenting rejection, but will not overcome a "same type" double patenting rejection under 35 U.S.C 101.

Patents 7110806, 6937883, 6889072, 6879853, 6754521, 6741881, 6662038, 6564085, 6463318, 6311085, 6278892, 6243600, 6240311, 6230041, 5924987, 5799649, 5792056, 5762065, 5746208, 5579767, 5553619, 5417213, should begin a non-exhaustive list of other possible related co-pending applications and patents alongside those mentioned in the instant application's continuing data.



FREDERICK R. SCHMIDT  
DIRECTOR  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700

### ***Claim Objections***

Claim 68 is objected to because of the following informalities: In line 2 of the Claim, "a flip angle is about 40 degrees" should read "a flip angle of about 40 degrees". Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 68 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In the instant case, Applicant sets forth that a flip angle of about 40 degrees is optimal in a specific case ( $T_1 = 200\text{ms}$ ) within the specification, but also gives a range of 150-200ms for arterial relaxation time and still further states that faster relaxation times require higher flip angles. It is unclear the order by which the term "about" limits the claim as there is never set forth a distinct range for flip angle variance within the specification.

### ***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29

USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

1. Claims 60-67, 69-79 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-21 of U.S. Patent No. 6,889,072.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the subject matter in the instant application would have been unpatentable in view of the patented case (6,889,072 B2).

2. Claim 68 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-21 of U.S. Patent No. 6,889,072 in view of Claims 15, 16, 17 of Patent No. 5,924,987 and Claim 1 of Patent No. 6,243,600.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the subject matter in the instant application would have been unpatentable in view of the patented case (6,889,072 B2) when applied to the teachings of the appropriate claims of the '600 and '987 Patents.

**Conclusion**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joel M. Lamprecht whose telephone number is (571) 272-3250. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:30AM-4PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian L. Casler can be reached on (571)272-4956. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



JML